DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 819 FL 003 066

AUTHOR Gomes da Costa, B.
TITLE The Design and Execution of a Language Testing Programme at University Level in the United Kingdom.
INSTITUTION Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France).
PUB DATE Oct 70
NOTE 45p.; Working paper delivered at the Symposium on Goal Analysis, Contents Definition and Evaluation in Modern Languages at University Level, Stockholm, Sweden, October 19-24, 1970

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Achievement Tests; College Language Programs; *College Majors; *German; Grammar; Language Learning Levels; *Language Proficiency; Language Research; *Language Tests; Learning Theories; Liberal Arts Majors; *Modern Languages; Second Language Learning; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *England

ABSTRACT

This paper describes an experimental testing program in England which parallels a broader, 1967 study concerning second language acquisition in the United States. The earlier study, conducted by John Carroll, concentrated on determining proficiency of language majors in five foreign languages. This experiment limits the field of study to German majors engaged in the British Honours Degree programs at several universities. Phase 1 is based on the MLA Advanced Proficiency Tests and the Carroll-Sapon Modern Language Aptitude Test. Additionally, Alice Heim's "AH5 Group Test of High Grade Intelligence" and a comprehensive questionnaire devised by the author were also administered to some 400 students. Conclusive results were not obtained for various reasons explained by the author. (RL)

ED 061819

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Strasbourg, 13 October, 1971

CCC/ESR (71) 70
Eng. only

COMMITTEE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

"THE DESIGN AND EXECUTION OF A LANGUAGE TESTING PROGRAMME AT UNIVERSITY LEVEL IN THE UNITED KINGDOM"

a working paper, delivered at

SYMPOSIUM on

"Goal analysis, contents definition and evaluation in modern languages at University level", Stockholm, 19 - 24 October 1970

under the aegis of the
Committee for Higher Education and Research
of the Council of Europe

C B. Gomes da Costa, Head, Department of Arts and Modern Languages, North East London Polytechnic, Dagenham, RM8 2AS, United Kingdom.

October 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

23.634
04.1

FL003066

Many of you will know the survey carried out by John Carroll in 1967 (1). According to Carroll its aims were: (i) to determine the ranges of proficiency levels attained by College "Majors" in five foreign languages; (ii) to interpret such proficiency levels on a so-called "absolute and meaningful scale" (a topic which I may touch upon briefly later); (iii) to study the inter-relationships of various aspects of foreign language attainment; (iv) to discover the factors that are associated with variations in performance in order to make inferences about what makes the high, and, I would add, just as interestingly the corollary: what makes for low levels of attainment.

While Carroll, a world authority in the field of experimental educational psychology, had the expertise, staff, and the financial resources to carry out a study in five languages, I was advised to be more modest when I proposed that a similar study should be carried out in the United Kingdom. But even apart from such scholarly considerations there were, let me call them euphemistically, "sociological" factors at work in the United Kingdom which makes the administration of such empirical surveys fraught with uncertainty. Indeed, it is an ex poste factor view of the uncertainties, now that the first part of the programme has been partly executed, which leads me to speak about the difficulties rather than to give an analytical account of hard data.

In the event, it was decided to restrict the study to the language in which I had competence to teach at degree level: German, and to spell out in the context of the rather heterogeneous range of the British Honours Degree some eleven hypotheses, to be tested in two phases. I describe here phase 1 only.

Eleven hypotheses are as follows:

1. On entry to degree. While the mean scores, especially for writing and reading, will vary roughly directly with the "prestige" of the institution, the extremes will be similar for all types of institution.

2. Other things being equal, length of time abroad will account for most of the variance, especially on the speaking test. This will be true of students at all stages, but for obvious reasons will be most striking at the end of the degree course.

3. Students whose subsidiary subject is not another modern foreign language will attain higher mean scores than those studying a second and/or third language, holding period of time spent in Germany constant.

./.

4. Those whose period abroad is split into approximately two six-month periods in two different countries will make lower mean scores than those who spend six months in Germany and who do not visit another foreign country for a substantial period of study.

5. The acquisition curve, especially on the two productive skills, will not be very steep during the period spent in the United Kingdom between entry to the degree course and the first lengthy period spent in Germany.

6. Where the third year is the "year abroad" mean learning increments between the end of the first year and the end of the second year will be small; least improvement in speaking, greatest improvement in reading.

7. There will be marked discontinuity in the acquisition curve after the period in Germany. Both intercept and slope will be greatly increased.

8. Measured mean increases in performance between entry to degree course and commencement of study/work period in Germany are a function of the number of contact (and preparation) hours devoted specifically, WHETHER BY ACCIDENT OR DESIGN, to German language.

9. Measured increases in performance after the period abroad are in large part a function of the nature of the work and social activities in the "abroad-situation". The greater the degree to which the student, in all his varied social roles, depends for "survival" on his ability to control his environment exclusively through the use of German, the greater will be measured increases.

10. The earlier and the longer the required period in Germany, the more favourable the students' attitude will be towards the task of learning the language and towards things German in general. Attitudes to these two factors will be least favourable among those spending the least amount of time in Germany.

11. Generally favourable attitudes on entry give way to disillusionment during the period of study in the United Kingdom, especially where the student's commitment is primarily to the goal of learning the language rather than to the more intellectual components of an honours degree course in modern languages, viz: literature, philology or area studies. Where the third year is to be spent abroad students at the end of the second year will be much less favourably inclined towards their studies than they were as new entrants and somewhat less favourably than at the end of their first year. The exceptions will be students who have already been able to spend a lengthy period (not less than three continuous months) in Germany, either before coming up or during the college vacations.

./.

Obviously if all the hypotheses refer to real language learning situations then they do imply the heterogeneity which I refer to above. An appendix gives an over-view of this heterogeneity (2) with respect to the variable which emerges as being of overriding importance throughout the hypotheses: Time Abroad.

SAMPLING

Institutional (restricted to England and Wales)

Absolute dependence on the willingness (or not, as the case may be) of the institutions ruled out random sampling within predetermined subsets or strata of institutional types. In the light of the hypotheses it was decided to include the following "strata":

1. Oxbridge
2. Technological Universities, formerly the CATs
3. "Classical" Honours degrees in German lasting three years.
4. "Classical" Honours degrees in German lasting four years.
5. German degrees at Polytechnics or Technical Colleges under the aegis of the Council for National Academic Awards.
6. Ideally, at least one institution where students took their degree in either three or four years, depending on their personal preferences and differing therefore solely with respect to the year abroad.

Within the Institutions' departments

Ideally it was hoped that every student in every department would turn up. It was of course realised that this was illusory and where departments were large, a minimum of twenty was aimed at, rather than a fixed proportion. All were taking finals at the end of the academic session 1969/70.

"One's sample is what one can get"

1. Cambridge agreed to co-operate: Oxford did not.
2. In the first instance, Bradford, Salford and Surrey Universities agreed to co-operate.
3. Manchester, Queen Mary College, London, and Southampton agreed.

./.

4. Newcastle and Birmingham agreed.

5. Ealing Technical College and Lanchester Polytechnic agreed.

6. In the first instance, Bangor, Bristol and Sheffield Universities also agreed.

Potentially then, this was a sample in excess of 400 students and, in addition to covering all the relevant course structures it appeared prima facie to cover all the student variables likely to be worth closer investigation.

The tests

The most striking fact in the search for instruments suitable for administration to UK Honours degree students is that there are no suitable published standardised tests in any language. The MLA Advanced Proficiency Tests (3) were employed therefore not only because replication of Carroll's work was in a healthy scientific tradition (indeed in a review of Frank Healey's book, "Foreign Language Teaching in the Universities", Carroll, writing in 1969, made an overt plea for the direct replication of his study in a European context) (4), but he who will test at this highest level HAS NO OTHER CHOICE!

The formal description of the tests is as follows:

Formal description of proficiency tests (MLA, USA)

1. Listening comprehension test (20 minutes, 36 items, maximum converted score = 56)

The student listens to a tape recording consisting of single utterances, a connected dialogue, a radio broadcast, and a three-part conversation. For all but the last part the examinee selects, from among four choices printed in his test book (always in a foreign language), the responses most likely to be made in the situations presented or the best answers to questions put to him. For the last part, the examinee marks on his answer sheet whether each of a number of statements about the conversation he has just heard is true or false. Questions are designed to test phonetic (or phonemic) discrimination, command of idiomatic expressions, vocabulary, and structure typical for conversation use of language. Comprehension of main facts, ideas, and important details is evaluated.

While the main object of this test is to measure listening comprehension, it depends to some extent upon reading comprehension because the alternatives to the multiple choice of questions are printed in the foreign language.

2. Speaking test (15 minutes, 105 items maximum converted score = 125)

This test has three parts. The student records all his answers on tape for later evaluation by expert scorers approved by MLA and ETS.

In Part A the student repeats fifteen sentences spoken on the tape by a master voice. In Part B, he is presented with short, printed texts which he must read aloud into the tape recorder. In both these parts, he is scored for the "rightness" and "wrongness" of his reproduction of certain specific sounds or intonation patterns. In addition, in Part B he is scored for the overall quality of his reading on a five-point scale.

In Part C, the examinee is presented with a single picture, a pictorial sequence, and a situation shown pictorially (with directions printed in English). In each case, he is asked to describe the picture or to react orally to the situation presented. On five-point scales, he is rated on vocabulary, pronunciation, structure and fluency.

3. Reading test (40 minutes, 50 items, maximum converted score = 70)

In Part A, the student is to select the appropriate lexical, idiomatic, or structural completion for each of fifteen incomplete statements. Part B consists of several short passages followed by questions (thirty in all) on the meaning of words and phrases as well as on the content of the selections. Part C contains five questions on short poetic excerpts. All materials - reading passages and questions - are in the foreign language.

4. Writing test (45 minutes, 60 items, maximum converted score = 80)

All items in this test are of the free response type, each to be scored right or wrong by expert scorers. Part A consists of short texts in which there are, in all, thirty blanks representing omitted words that are to be filled in from the context. The student supplies, on a separate answer sheet, a single word that is appropriate both in meaning and form. (In the case of the Russian test, the base form of each word is supplied, and the student is to supply the appropriate inflected form.) Part B is an "interlinear exercise" consisting of texts "poorly written" (as if, say, by a student) containing, in all, thirty grammatical, lexical, or idiomatic errors that are to be found and corrected by the examinee. The examinee is scored right for each error properly corrected, and wrong for each error improperly corrected or unnoticed. Credit is not given for performance on parts of the test containing no planned errors. The Russian test differs slightly in that the errors in the first text are identified by underlining.

How valid are the Tests?

Carroll reached the conclusion that certain parts of the test were quite inadequate for the highest levels of linguistic performance (5). They had, he reported, a definite ceiling. Undoubtedly they will be shown to have a "ceiling effect" for our tested population too. But at the time of writing the location of this ceiling is still an open question.

Further serious argument can also be levelled at the tests both on practical and theoretical grounds. I quote here Leon Jakobovits (6) at some length, "... the major problem in test construction consists of making up an adequate sample of discreet units which would be representative of the minimum number that defined 'knowing' the facts of that language", and "the discreet-point approach is still a major one in the language testing field today; it can be shown to be seriously inadequate on both theoretical and practical grounds. From the practical point of view, its inadequacy is clearly demonstrated by the fact, well-known to all teachers, that students who obtain relatively high scores on such language tests (also: achievement tests) do not necessarily at the same time also have the capacity of using the language in a communicative setting such as carrying out a free conversation with a native speaker. Similarly, individuals who are quite capable of communicating with natives in a variety of settings do not necessarily obtain high scores on such performance or achievement tests. Thus, performance on these language tests and the ability to make use of the language for communicative purposes are not necessarily related, indicating thereby, that the former is not a good measure of the latter". Jakobovits then goes on to say: "This lack of intrinsic relationship is clearly accounted for by the conceptions currently in vogue in linguistics, thus demonstrating the theoretical inadequacy of the approach under consideration ... knowledge about a language does not consist of a finite set of facts that pertain to the surface structure of a language (which these tests attempt to sample). Current linguistic theory has clearly shown that a significant (if not major) portion which constitutes knowledge about a language is not even expressed at the surface level but lies hidden in its deep or underlying structure, and thus far, no standard tests have been developed which measure this knowledge".

While I accept Jakobovits' theoretical objections I remain unconvinced about the practical ones. If taken too seriously however both types of objection would simply paralyse all efforts at empirical evaluation and to take one concrete example, we would be without John Carroll's trenchant report, criticising undergraduate language teaching in the USA.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Using Carroll's nomenclature (7) I shall call the scores which the students achieve on the MLA German tests the "Dependent Criterion Variables" and turn my attention to the "Independent Predictor Variables". It is hoped to explain patterned variations in the former in terms of the latter.

1. Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT) short form (8)

It would be convenient if when selecting students for language degrees we had a more stable, valid and reliable touchstone than the General Certificate of Education at Advanced Level results. Carroll's MLAT is probably the best known published test of language learning potential. Carroll, who admittedly has a strong vested interest in the instrument, used it as an independent variable and, in the interest of replication (and faute de mieux once more) I have too.

Incidentally, it is my understanding that work is also currently in progress at the University of Essex Language Centre on MLAT's Predictive Validity with respect to the United Kingdom undergraduates (9). I am told informally that the short form has as much predictive power as a full-blown version and its predicting power is not very high anyway.

2. Intelligence Quotient

Work by Pimsleur and others in the USA has led to the conclusion that IQ is only a moderately good predictor of language attainment (10). Little survey work on the relationship between IQ and University Language Attainment appears to have been carried out in the United Kingdom. It seemed particularly appropriate to look at the correlation between IQ and Language Attainment since Alice Heim at the University of Cambridge has published a very sophisticated intelligence test designed especially for those whose measurable IQ is in the upper reaches of the Gaussian Curve (11). This instrument, AH5, certainly does not appear to have a "ceiling effect" with respect to the population under investigation. AH5 has, of course, been widely used and validated in particular at the University of Cambridge, and norms for various types of student have been published. It has also been used in research on students studying for degrees other than in modern languages. But to my knowledge my investigation is the first in which a fairly large and, prima facie, nationally representative sample of Germanists has had its IQ accurately measured. Thus, in addition to shedding some light on the correlations I have mentioned we should also be able to compare the measured intelligence of these modern linguists as a group with, say, their peers in physics, mathematics, history or sociology.

3. Student Variables or Jakobovits' "Learner Factors" (12)

Carroll has a fairly compact student questionnaire which I have not bothered to reproduce for the purposes of this lecture. In my testing programme I have not copied the Carroll Questionnaire in its entirety for two reasons:

(i) although it was a very useful starting point for systematising those variables which might throw light on my hypotheses, it seemed to me not to be exhaustive - this was confirmed in personal conversations I had with Carroll at Princeton at the beginning of 1969;

(ii) because of the obvious differences in the education systems and the different language learning traditions of the two countries, much was inappropriate.

In the event, the formulation of the questionnaire proved to be a mammoth task. An initial pilot questionnaire was drafted in the form of open-ended questions which covered all factors which I hypothesised might even be remotely connected with variations in the levels of foreign language performance. Again, in a relatively short lecture like this I do not feel that it is worth while to circularise this pilot questionnaire. But let me say that about 1,250 pilots were sent out and the response rate was about 33% without follow-ups. It will give you some indication of its complexity if I tell you that it took up to two hours to complete, but I must again stress that almost all the questions were open-ended. We were trying as far as possible to avoid response sets at that stage of the investigations.

The next task was to content analyse these pilot questionnaires and we obtained expert advice on this from Dr. William Belson, Director of the Survey Research Centre of the London School of Economics. It soon became obvious that my initial (rather amateur) enthusiasm for exhaustiveness had to be disciplined. It was necessary to limit the amount of data collected to essentials and to forego the inclusion of data in the category of "WOULDN'T IT BE INTERESTING TO INCLUDE ...?" for two reasons: (1) it is going to prove difficult to do justice to all the data we have collected in the "abbreviated questionnaire", and (2) there is an upper limit to the amount of time students are willing to sit and fill in complicated questionnaires which tax both endurance and above all their fragile memory of yesteryear. (Parenthetically I might add that I was surprised how far students repress details of their language learning experience at school and university since I can still remember much of my own.)

Ultimately, the questionnaire was reduced to manageable proportions, almost completely precoded and took on average just over half-an-hour to complete (13).

The following, as you will see from the questionnaire, are the independent variables:

1. Student's background.

2. Structure of degree curriculum and individual's approach to his studies.

3. Student's career orientation.

4. Student's own assessment of German courses: note that the arbitrary breakdown of subject areas, especially the dichotomisation of productive and receptive language skills.

5. A detailed analysis of the duration and nature of the in-country visit(s).

6. A simple-minded attempt to shed some light on Wallace Lambert's concepts of "Instrumental" versus "Integrative" language learning orientations (14).

Originally, it had been planned to supplement (and to some extent to do a cross validation of) this information through a further questionnaire for heads of German departments. But in the light of the exhaustiveness of the questionnaire, the completion of which was, where appropriate, a joint effort by each group tested, and Carroll's finding that the perceptions of instructional and curricula practice of heads of departments were often less than realistic, it was decided to dispense with a further departmental questionnaire.

In the other variables which departments were requested to supply were the following for all potential testees regardless of whether they actually took part in the testing or not:

1. the subjects and grades each student had passed at the GCE "O" level;

2. subjects and grades each student had passed at the GCE "A" level;

3. the student's degree results.

A self-contained study of the predictive value of ordinary and advanced level results for this sample will ultimately be undertaken.

I should perhaps add that we asked the universities to supply these grades rather than asking the students themselves since we had some evidence that the students' memories were not reliable.

RESPONSE AND CO-OPERATION

Since this initial phase of the testing programme was completed by early June 1970, I should now, in October 1970, be discussing and analysing a computer print-out of the interesting relationships between independent variables or linear composites of these and the students' scores on the Modern Language Association advanced proficiency tests. I cannot do this since I am still awaiting GCE results and finals from at least half-a-dozen of the institutions at which I tested. The first official request for this information was despatched on 19 May 1970. There have been numerous follow-up telephone calls and letters since. At best this information will be furnished in toto by mid-November 1970. Since all the data is to be processed electronically the inputs must be, for want of a better expression "holistic". No processing can occur until the last piece of data has been obtained.

This particular lack of response or lack of a very ready response to a demand for crucial variables, brings me to a discussion of the response problem in general.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE - HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS

First of all I should like to say some things which are polemical. All degree courses in modern languages in the United Kingdom include a language test of a highly sophisticated kind. I refer here in particular to the translation of a piece of prose into the target language. The other conventional examination techniques are also quite difficult: translation from the target language; one or more free compositions in the target language; and an oral examination which, in principle at least, can be very searching.

I would suggest, however, that there is a glaring discrepancy between most of the conventional language work undertaken during the Honours Degree course and the highly sophisticated tasks set at the end. I would go one step further, AND I SPEAK HERE FROM ACTUALLY HAVING DONE THE JOB and say that many if not most of those university teachers whose mother tongue is English are not really capable of rendering, say, a passage of Bertrand Russell flawlessly into the target language which they purport to teach. Yet it is they who frequently set and mark those composition papers in finals.

In sum, a genuinely searching language examination is administered at the end of our Honours Degree courses for which students have not been adequately prepared, and it is frequently marked by those who would not themselves gain 100% marks were the whole exercise set and marked exclusively by, say, native speakers long resident in the United Kingdom.

Try to suggest the elimination of prose composition as a teaching method, and the average lecturer or professor in modern languages throws up his hands in horror, protesting the importance of mastery of the foreign language within the Honours Degree.

How strange then that, given the opportunity to investigate the effectiveness of varying instructional procedures at the sacrifice of a mere day per year in a three or four year curriculum, so many heads of departments declare themselves unwilling or unable to give the matter any consideration.

What is perhaps just as disturbing is the evidence from 400 or so pilot questionnaires of a deep-rooted malaise among modern language students in respect of their classroom experience in modern languages. Admittedly the pilot study was confined to students of German but the principles involved are unlikely to differ significantly in other modern foreign languages. The malaise increases steeply as the Honours Degree course proceeds, reaching a peak, among those whose interest is not in literature or philology, in their final year. Presumably, because faced shortly with a task of earning a living they have not been brought to the suitable level of "communicative competence".

Yet despite demands for general student participation and a more relevant curriculum, of a total invited sample of 1970 finalists of about 400 students, drawn from the thirteen institutions which did finally agree to co-operate, only 174 students actually turned up to the testing session, and even to get this proportion we had to return to some of the institutions on as much as three separate occasions.

Detailed response rates at the thirteen institutions are given as a footnote (15).

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE FUTURE

The short term

I quote from the 1967 Carroll study: "Although further, descriptive, evaluative studies like the present one would be useful, particularly for the purpose of long-range cross sectional comparison over a period of years, many questions concerning the education and training of foreign language students would have to be approached through experimental or longitudinal studies in which the effects of various types of learning experiences would be assessed by comparing pre-test and post-test performances. For example, we need to know more precisely what the effects of study and travel abroad are, and what level of preparation the student should have for him to obtain maximal advantage from such study abroad. Such information could materially aid in the better design of a foreign language educational programme" (16).

We have just begun phase 2 of our study, increasing our institutional sample by two. Students have just been tested on entry and there will be a longitudinal follow-up every twelve months or so depending on the structure of the programme. All students will, however, be tested immediately prior to the period abroad and again immediately on their return to the United Kingdom. Having established a common base line which may of course have a significantly different mean score and variance between institutions, we shall watch the growth of learning curves intently, trying to account for perceived differences in terms of the key student and institutional factors in our questionnaire.

MID- AND LONG-TERM PROSPECTS

1. Tests Scores on the MLA tests rank students, but little real absolute meaning can be attached to a given set of scores. Carroll carried out a subsidiary study to determine "tentative equivalencies" between the MLA skill tests and the S(speaking) and R(reading) absolute proficiency ratings rendered through individually conducted interview tests conducted by teams from the Foreign Service Institute.

Carroll then equated listening and speaking scores on MLA with FSIS readings; and reading and writing scores with the R ratings.

I circulated some handouts on FSI absolute language proficiency ratings (17) since I feel sure that the future lies with (a) an improvement of these operational definitions; (b) thereby making sense of a pass/fail system and (c) a restatement of what could realistically be obtained in a target language. Gone is the mythical "near-native proficiency" which features so prominently in the advertising matter of some of the newer courses in the United Kingdom and which, of course, means different things to different people. And in its place is probably a more modest goal, yet one which we will know to have been achieved, or not, as the case may be.

2. Issues Given the evidence in the Carroll study of the potent effect of residence abroad, I find it strange that there are still some degree courses in the United Kingdom which have failed to institutionalise "the year abroad". For this means that in many cases an Honours student of German may have spent no more than six weeks in Germany before being let loose to teach German language to GCE "A" level. Tradition dies hard and I am glad to say that nowadays such courses are in a tiny minority.

So the issue of the effectiveness of the period abroad may well become something of a dead duck in the United Kingdom. But of increasing importance is the issue of the optimum level of preparation before sending the student abroad.

Here I see a big empirical evaluation battle to be fought on (1) the optimal distribution of skills, i.e. productive versus receptive; (2) methodology, i.e. massed versus distributive practice (18). Paradoxically, so-called modern methods seem to me to stress the productive skills while THROUGHOUT OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS sticking to distributive practice, AND GIVING A RELATIVELY POOR PAY-OFF.

If we accept the potency of the period abroad and intend to implement it, it is worth while considering that a better pay-off might be found in reverting to the receptive skills within a situation of mass practice as a preparation for a mass practice situation of both receptive and productive skills, i.e. abroad.

All this is hypothesis and the only way to validate it is to implement appropriate language teaching programmes and then to evaluate them using refined instruments of the kind I have suggested that will ultimately have to be developed.

Footnotes

(1) John B. Carroll, "The Foreign Language Attainments of Language Majors in the Senior Year: a survey conducted in US colleges and universities", Laboratory for Research in Instruction, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1967.

(2) As set out in appendix No. 1.

(3) For an overview of the genesis and structure of these tests see W. Starr, "Proficiency tests in modern foreign languages" publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 1961, 76(2), 7-11, and
ibid. "MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students", publications of the MLA of America, 1962, 77, (4 Part 2), 31-42.

(4) See International Review of Education, XV, 1969, 3, p. 367.

(5) Carroll, op. cit., p. 40, 48, 55, 58, 199.

(6) L. Jakobovits, "A psycholinguistic Analysis of Second-Language Learning and Bilingualism". Centre for Comparative Psycholinguistics, Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois, July 1969, mimeo. manuscript prepared under the auspices of the International Centre for Research on Bilingualism, Université Laval. See in particular chapter 1.

(7) Carroll, op. cit. chapter 8.

(8) The Carroll-Sapon "Modern Language Aptitude Test" is published by the Psychological Corporation of New York. According to the publisher it will help to:

identify students with an "ear for language"
predict how rapidly students will learn a foreign language
place students in fast and slow sections of language classes
diagnose student difficulties in language learning.

Additionally the following is contained in descriptive literature of MLAT.

What the MLAT Measures - a Special Collection of Abilities Relevant to Foreign Language Learning.

The Parts of the Test	The Tasks	The Abilities Measured
1 Number Learning	to learn words for numbers in an artificial language	auditory alertness and the ability to remember

./.

The Parts of the Test	The Tasks	The Abilities Measured
II Phonetic Script	to listen to sounds and learn phonetic symbols for them	sound-symbol association ability; related to ability to mimic spoken sounds
III Spelling Clues	to decipher phonetically spelled English words and to identify words with similar meanings	the ability to derive meanings from symbols: related to sound-symbol association
IV Word in Sentences	to recognise the functions that words and phrases perform in sentences	sensitivity to grammatical structure
V Paired Associates	to learn and recall words in an artificial language	rote memory aspect of foreign language learning

How the MLAT works

The five parts of the test consist of practice exercises in language learning. The tape-recorded portions appraise the student's "ear for language" and the other parts appraise his aptitude for dealing with reading material. The complete test is administered with a tape recording and requires about an hour.

The short form, which may be given without a tape machine, consists of the last three parts of the test. Administration time is thirty minutes.

The speed and accuracy with which the student learns the artificial language and other tasks in the test situation shows how he is likely to respond to foreign language instruction in the classroom - whether he will find language learning difficult or whether he will learn quickly and easily. Students who score high on the MLAT are likely to become proficient in a foreign language more quickly than those who score low.

The MLAT predicts ease of learning and success in any foreign language.

The MLAT measures the basic language learning abilities of the English speaking student. The test is applicable to any foreign language - modern or classical - and to languages using other alphabets, as well as to those using the Roman alphabet.

The MLAT has been used with students in high schools and colleges to predict success in the more commonly taught languages - French, German, Latin, Spanish and Russian. It has been used by the Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State, the armed services, church mission groups and business firms to predict success in a wide variety of other languages - Mandarin Chinese, Czech, Polish, Romanian, Bulgarian, Greek, Japanese, Korean, etc. The Peace Corps has found the MLAT useful in the selection of student trainees for assignments requiring the mastery of African and other languages and dialects.

Instructions for the test are given in English and the several parts of the test assume knowledge of English. The MLAT is useful only with literate persons who know English with native or near-native fluency. The test is not suitable for foreign students who want to learn English.

Use of the MLAT by schools and colleges

Teachers and counsellors may use the MLAT to advantage in helping decide which students are most likely to profit from foreign language courses, and for the diagnosis of language learning problems.

Because MLAT scores indicate the level of students' language learning capability, they may be grouped according to aptitude level so that they progress at roughly comparable rates. MLAT part scores help forecast the kinds of difficulties that a student may have, thus indicating to the teacher and to the student the area in which a student will have to make special effort and to spend more time. MLAT scores show the student's capability for language learning, but not his interest or motivation. With MLAT scores at hand, the teacher or guidance counsellor can more readily determine whether a student's difficulties arise from limitations in ability or from other factors.

Use of the MLAT by employers

Where the learning of a foreign language is a requirement for a job, the MLAT aids employers in the selection process. The MLAT enables employers in government, business, and industry to select those applicants who show reasonable promise of rapid learning and early attainment of proficiency. By developing appropriate expectancy tables, an employer can more readily make the decision as to which employees or applicants are likely to repay the time and expense of training in a foreign language.

NORMS: Percentiles for grades 9, 10, 11, college freshmen, and several groups of adults, including a group of men in intensive training.

OTHER DATA: Validity, reliability and inter-correlational data are given in the MLAT Manual. SCORING: hand or machine.

The Modern Language Aptitude Test (the MLAT) was developed by John B. Carroll and Stanley M. Sapon under a grant from the Carnegie Corporation. The same authors have also developed the Elementary Modern Language Aptitude Test (EMLAT) for grades 3 through 6.

(9) See University of Essex, Language Centre, Occasional Paper No. 7 "L2 Learning", Colchester, November 1970.

(10) See P. Pimleur, et alii, "Underachievement in Foreign Language Learning", Final Report. Ohio State University, Columbus, Research Foundation, April 1963.

(11) See A. Heim, "AH5 Group Test of High-Grade Intelligence: Manual", Revised Edition, National Foundation for Educational Research, Slough, UK, 1968.

(12) Jakobovits, op. cit., esp. Chapter 4. 1.

(13) Full version appears as Appendix No. 2.

(14) W. Lambert, "Psychological Approaches to the Study of Language" in J. Michel, (ed) "Foreign Language Teaching: an anthology", Macmillan, N.Y., 1967.

(15) Response Rates - Phase I: Session 1969/70 - "finalists"

	Institution	Actual Number Tested	Potential Maximum No. Testable	% Responding
1.	Bangor	3	26	11.53
2.	Birmingham	NONE	30	0
3.	Bradford	14	20	70
4.	Bristol	21	58	36.21
5.	Cambridge	22	78	28
6.	Ealing	9	10	90
7.	Lanchester	15	16	93.75
8.	Manchester	20	29	68.9
9.	Newcastle	22	35	62.8
10.	QMC London	11	12	91.6
11.	Salford	NONE	25	0
12.	Southampton	23	34	67.6
13.	Surrey	14	16	87.5
	Total	174	389	44.8

./.

(16) Carroll, op. cit., p. 207.

(17) The Foreign Service Institute School of Language Studies in the US Department of State describes the ABSOLUTE LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY RATINGS as follows:

The rating scales described below have been developed by the Foreign Service Institute to provide a meaningful method of characterising the language skills of foreign service personnel of the Department of State and of other government agencies. Unlike academic grades, which measure achievement in mastering the content of a prescribed course, the S-rating for speaking proficiency and the R-rating for reading proficiency are based on the absolute criterion of the command of an educated native speaker of the language.

The definition of each proficiency level has been worded so as to be applicable to every language; obviously the amount of time and training required to reach a certain level will vary widely from language to language, as will the specific linguistic features. Nevertheless, a person with S-3's in both French and Chinese, for example, should have approximately equal linguistic competence in the two languages.

The scales are intended to apply principally to government personnel engaged in international affairs, especially of a diplomatic, political, economic and cultural nature. For this reason heavy stress is laid at the upper levels on accuracy of structure and precision of vocabulary sufficient to be both acceptable and effective in dealings with the educated citizen of the foreign country.

As currently used, all the ratings except the S-5 and R-5 may be modified by a plus (+), indicating that proficiency substantially exceeds the minimum requirements for the level involved but falls short of those for the next higher level.

DEFINITIONS OF ABSOLUTE RATINGS

ELEMENTARY PROFICIENCY

S-1 Able to satisfy routine travel needs and minimum courtesy requirements. Can ask and answer questions on topics very familiar to him; within the scope of his very limited language experience can understand simple questions and statements, allowing for slowed speech, repetition or paraphrase; speaking vocabulary inadequate to express anything but the most elementary needs; errors in pronunciation and grammar are frequent, but can be understood by a native speaker used to dealing with foreigners attempting to speak

./.

his language; while topics which are "very familiar" and elementary needs vary considerably from individual to individual, any person at the S-1 level should be able to order a simple meal, ask for shelter or lodging, ask and give simple directions, make purchases, and tell the time.

R-1 Able to read some personal and place names, street signs, office and shop designations, numbers, and isolated words and phrases. Can recognise all the letters in the printed version of an alphabetic system and high-frequency elements of a syllabary or a character system.

LIMITED WORKING PROFICIENCY

S-2 Able to satisfy routine social demands and limited work requirements. Can handle with confidence but not with facility most social situations including introductions and casual conversations about current events, as well as work, family, and autobiographical information; can handle limited work requirements, needing help in handling any complications or difficulties; can get the gist of most conversations on non-technical subjects (i.e. topics which require no specialised knowledge) and has a speaking vocabulary sufficient to express himself simply with some circumlocutions; accent, though often quite faulty, is intelligible; can usually handle elementary constructions quite accurately but does not have thorough or confident control of the grammar.

R-2 Able to read simple prose, in a form equivalent to typescript or printing, on subjects within a familiar context. With extensive use of a dictionary can get the general sense of routine business letters, international news items, or articles in technical fields within his competence.

MINIMUM PROFESSIONAL PROFICIENCY

S-3 Able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics. Can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence with reasonable ease; comprehension is quite complete for a normal rate of speech; vocabulary is broad enough that he rarely has to grope for a word; accent may be obviously foreign; control of grammar good; errors never interfere with understanding and rarely disturb the native speaker.

R-3 Able to read standard newspaper items addressed to the general reader, routine correspondence, reports and technical material in his special field. Can grasp the essentials of articles of the above types without using a dictionary; for accurate understanding moderately frequent use of a dictionary is required. Has occasional difficulty with unusually complex structures and low-frequency idioms.

FULL PROFESSIONAL PROFICIENCY

S-4 Able to use the language fluently and accurately on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. Can understand and participate in any conversation within the range of his experience with a high degree of fluency and precision of vocabulary; would rarely be taken for a native speaker, but can respond appropriately even in unfamiliar situations; errors of pronunciation and grammar quite rare; can handle informal interpreting from and into the language.

R-4 Able to read all styles and forms of the language pertinent to professional needs. With occasional use of a dictionary can read moderately difficult prose readily in any area directed to the general reader, and all material in his special field including official and professional documents and correspondence; can read reasonably legible handwriting without difficulty.

NATIVE OR BILINGUAL PROFICIENCY

S-5 Speaking proficiency equivalent to that of an educated native speaker. Has complete fluency in the language such that his speech on all levels is fully accepted by educated native speakers in all of its features, including breadth of vocabulary and idiom, colloquialisms, and pertinent cultural references.

R-5 Reading proficiency equivalent to that of an educated native. Can read extremely difficult and abstract prose, as well as highly colloquial writings and the classic literary forms of the language. With varying degrees of difficulty can read all normal kinds of handwritten documents.

(18) See L. Jakobovits' "Foreign Language Learning: a psycholinguistic analysis of the issues", Newbury House, Rowley, Mass., 1970, p. 84, footnote No. 1.

	SINGLE HONOURS										COMBINED HONOURS																	
	ABROAD										ABROAD																	
	> 6 WEEKS		1 TERM +		2 TERMS +		3 TERMS +		12 MONTHS +		> 6 WEEKS				1 TERM +				2 TERMS +				3 TERMS +				12 MONTHS +			
	SPLIT	NON-SPLIT	SPLIT	NON-SPLIT	SPLIT	NON-SPLIT	SPLIT	NON-SPLIT	SPLIT	NON-SPLIT	SPLIT		NON-SPLIT		SPLIT		NON-SPLIT		SPLIT		NON-SPLIT		SPLIT		NON-SPLIT		SPLIT		NON-SPLIT	
	(more than one definition may apply)										1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries
ASTON																												
BIRMINGHAM									✓														✓					
BRADFORD																								✓				
BRISTOL *									✓															✓				
DURHAM								✓																				✓
EALING																												✓
EAST ANGLIA								✓																✓				
EXETER *								✓																				
HULL *								✓																				
KEELE *																							✓					
KENT								✓																			✓	✓
LANCHESTER																								✓				
LEICESTER								✓																				✓
LIVERPOOL *								✓																				
LONDON (Kings)									✓																		✓	
LSE								✓																				
LONDON * (Westfield)									✓																		✓	
MANCHESTER								✓																				
NEWCASTLE									✓																			
NOTTINGHAM																				✓								
OXFORD *																												
PORTSMOUTH																											✓	✓
READING								✓																			✓	
SALFORD																					✓	✓						
SHEFFIELD *									✓																			✓
SOUTHAMPTON *									✓																			
SURREY								✓														✓						
SUSSEX								✓																				
WALES (Aberystwyth)								✓																				
WALES * (Swansea)									✓																			
WALES (Cardiff)								✓																				
WALES (Bangor)									✓																			
WALES (Lampeter)									✓																			
WARWICK								✓																				

UNIVERSITIES

3 Year Course

SINGLE HONOURS — ABROAD

	> 6 WEEKS		1 TERM +		2 TERMS +		3 TERMS +		12 MONTHS +	
	SPLIT	NON-SPLIT	SPLIT	NON-SPLIT	SPLIT	NON-SPLIT	SPLIT	NON-SPLIT	SPLIT	NON-SPLIT
	(Cannot by definition apply)									
BRISTOL										
EXETER						✓				
HULL				✓						
KEELE										
LIVERPOOL				✓						
LONDON (Bedford)				✓						
LONDON (Queen Mary)				✓						
LONDON (Royal Holloway)				✓						
LONDON (Westfield)						✓				
NOTTINGHAM				✓						
OXFORD				✓						
SHEFFIELD				✓						
SOUTHAMPTON						✓				
WALES (Bangor)				✓						

COMBINED HONOURS — ABROAD

	> 6 WEEKS				1 TERM +				2 TERMS +				3 TERMS +				12 MONTHS +			
	SPLIT		NON-SPLIT		SPLIT		NON-SPLIT		SPLIT		NON-SPLIT		SPLIT		NON-SPLIT		SPLIT		NON-SPLIT	
	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries	1 country	2 countries
BRISTOL							✓													
EXETER											✓									
HULL			✓																	
KEELE							✓													
LIVERPOOL																				
LONDON (Bedford)							✓													
LONDON (Queen Mary)							✓													
LONDON (Royal Holloway)																				
LONDON (Westfield)												✓								
NOTTINGHAM																				
OXFORD																				
SHEFFIELD											✓			✓		✓				
SOUTHAMPTON																				
WALES (Bangor)																				

APPENDIX NO. 1B

BRISTOL — Combined honours (excluding another language) - three year course.

EXETER — Single honours - three or four year course (optional) combined honours - three year course (except French and German - one year in France)

HULL — Two alternatives for both single and combined honours:

(1) one academic year abroad (i.e. four year course);

(2) one term abroad (i.e. three year course).

KEELE — Two alternatives for combined honours (excluding another language):

(1) intercalate a year abroad (i.e. four year course);

(2) one summer term abroad (i.e. three year course).

Combined honours (including another language):

(1) intercalate a year abroad in two countries;

(2) intercalate a year abroad in one country.

LIVERPOOL — Two alternatives for single honours:

(1) intercalate a year abroad (i.e. four year course);

(2) the period November to February of final year (i.e. three year course).

LONDON (WESTFIELD) — Two alternatives for single honours:

(1) one term (obligatory) + one long vacation (optional) (i.e. three year course);

(2) one year abroad after first or second year (i.e. four year course).

OXFORD — Combined honours - one year abroad in one or two countries.

SHEFFIELD — Two alternatives for single honours:

(1) one term abroad (i.e. three year course);

(2) one year abroad (i.e. four year course).

SOUTHAMPTON — Alternatives for combined honours:

(1) French/German - one full year abroad (i.e. four year course);

(2) German/Spanish - two alternatives:

(a) two long vacations abroad (three year course),

(b) one year abroad (four year course).

(3) German + Music or Philosophy - one term abroad (i.e. three year course);

(4) German + English or Greek or History or Latin - two long vacations abroad (three year course).

WALES
BANGOR — Two alternatives for single honours:

(1) one term abroad (i.e. three year course);

(2) one full year abroad (i.e. four year course).

APPENDIX NO. 2

GERMAN LANGUAGE

A SAMPLE SURVEY OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES IN THE UK

Principal Investigator: B. GOMES DA COSTA
NE LONDON POLYTECHNIC

Statistical Consultant: T.M.F. SMITH
SOUTHAMPTON UNIVERSITY

SURNAME _____ INITIALS _____

NOTE: MOST OF THE QUESTIONS CAN BE ANSWERED SIMPLY BY PUTTING A CIRCLE ROUND THE "CODE" NUMBER OPPOSITE THE APPROPRIATE ANSWER

			Office use
1. Your sex: Male	1		
Female	2		
RING ONE CODE			
2. Your age: under 18		1	
18 - 19		2	
20 - 21		3	
RING ONE CODE 22 - 23		4	
24 - 25		5	
over 25		6	

3. Your university or college:	RING ONE CODE	Office use only	
Bangor	11	31	
Birmingham	12	32	
Bradford	13	33	
Bristol	14	34	
Cambridge	15	35	
Ealing	16	36	
Lanchester	17	37	
Manchester	18	38	
Newcastle	19	39	
Nottingham	21	41	
Queen Mary, London	22	42	
Salford	23	43	
Sheffield	24	44	
Southampton	25	45	
Surrey	26	46	
Sussex	27	47	
Westfield	28	48	
	29	49	

4. Is your degree course 3 years or 4 years (including any period abroad)? RING ONE CODE			
	3 years	1	
	4 years	2	

/.

YOUR BACKGROUND

			Office use
5.	In what type of place did you live longest between the ages of 11 and 18?		
	RING ONE CODE ONLY — Farm or open country	1	
	Village	2	
	Small town	3	
	Large town	4	
	"Dormitory" town or commuting suburb	5	
	Suburb of a large metropolitan area	6	
	Central city or large metropolitan area	7	
6.	(a) Is English your "mother tongue"? RING ONE CODE — Yes	1	
	No	2	
	IF NO		
	(b) Is German your "mother tongue"? RING ONE CODE — Yes	4	
	No	5	
7.	(a) Is German used at all in your own home now? RING ONE CODE — Yes	1	
	No	2	
	IF YES		
	(b) How much is it used? Almost always	4	
	Most of the time	5	
	About half the time	6	
	RING ONE CODE — Less than half the time	7	
	Just a little/none	8	

8. What type of secondary school did you attend mainly?	Up to "O" level	"O" to "A"
(a) Up to "O" level? (b) From "O" to "A" level? Comprehensive	Y	Y
Grammar or Grammar Technical	X	X
Technical	0	0
Secondary modern	1	1
Bilateral: Grammar modern	2	2
Bilateral: Technical modern	3	3
Direct grant	4	4
PLEASE RING ONE CODE ONLY IN EACH COLUMN — Public school	5	5
Other independent	6	6
At school outside the UK	7	7

./.

			Office use
9. (a) Were you taught German at all during your primary schooling?	Yes	1	
RING ONE CODE	No	2	
(b) At what age did you start having formal instruction in German? (i.e. inside or outside school)	10 or under	1	
	11	2	
	12	3	
	13	4	
RING ONE CODE	14	5	
	15	6	
	16	7	
	17	8	
	18 or over	9	

IF YOU DID NOT LEARN GERMAN AT SECONDARY SCHOOL, SKIP Q.10 AND GO TO Q.11
IF YOU DID LEARN GERMAN AT SECONDARY SCHOOL, CONTINUE WITH Q.10

10. The teaching of German can be divided into 4 main "skills" (necessarily somewhat arbitrary):
Listening/understanding; speaking; reading; writing;
What importance, would you say, was attached to the teaching of each of these skills in your school:

RING ONE CODE FOR "O" LEVEL AND ONE FOR "A" LEVEL

	Very great importance	Great importance	Some importance	Not much importance	Very little importance
(a) Up to "O" level?					
(b) From "O" to "A" level?					
Listening to/understanding German:					
Up to "O"	5	4	3	2	1
"O" to "A"	5	4	3	2	1
Speaking German:					
Up to "O"	5	4	3	2	1
"O" to "A"	5	4	3	2	1
Reading German:					
Up to "O"	5	4	3	2	1
"O" to "A"	5	4	3	2	1
Writing German:					
Up to "O"	5	4	3	2	1
"O" to "A"	5	4	3	2	1

./.

YOUR DEGREE AND GERMAN STUDIES

		Office use
11. Which of the following best describes your degree course?	RING ONE CODE ONLY	
Single honours German:		
(a) No subsidiary subject in any year	1	
(b) + 1 or more modern foreign languages as subsidiaries	2	
(c) + 1 or more subjects other than a modern foreign language (e.g. economics, Greek, etc.)	3	
Joint honours/equal double German:		
(a) + 1 other modern foreign language (no subsidiary)	4	
(b) + 1 subject other than a modern foreign language (no subsidiary).....	5	
(c) + 1 other modern foreign language + a 3rd modern foreign language as subsidiary	6	
(d) + 1 subject other than a modern foreign language + a 2nd modern foreign language as subsidiary ...	7	
(e) + 1 other modern foreign language + 1 subject other than a modern foreign language as subsidiary	8	
(f) + 1 subject other than a modern foreign language and a 2nd as subsidiary	9	
General degree in German with:		
(a) 2 other modern foreign languages	0	
(b) 1 other modern foreign language and one other subject	X	

			Office use
12. (a)	Does your university prescribe a compulsory visit to a German-speaking country as part of your course?		
	RING ONE CODE	Prescribes 1 Allows 2 Neither 3	
	IF YOU ARE READING ANOTHER MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE (either as a major or subsidiary subject)		
(b)	Does your university/college prescribe a visit to an appropriate country for this language?		
	RING ONE CODE	Prescribes 5 Allows 6 Neither 7	
	IF PRESCRIBES OR ALLOWS AT (b)		
(c)	Did this visit for the second language take place:		
RING ONE CODE	Immediately prior to your "German" visit	1	
	OR Immediately after your "German" visit	2	
	OR On a quite separate occasion but before your "German" visit	3	
	OR On a quite separate occasion but after your "German" visit	4	
	OR Did you not take such a visit?	5	

./.

13. How many official class periods altogether (i.e. lectures, classes, tutorials, etc.) dealt with any aspect of German in <u>each year</u> of your course? <u>PLEASE RING ONE CODE IN EACH COLUMN. (OMIT "4TH YEAR" ONLY IF YOU ARE TAKING A 3 YEAR COURSE)</u>	Class periods per week	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year	Office use
	None	Y	Y	Y	Y	
	1 - 4	X	X	X	X	
	5	0	0	0	0	
	6	1	1	1	1	
	7	2	2	2	2	
	8	3	3	3	3	
	9	4	4	4	4	
	10	5	5	5	5	
	11	6	6	6	6	
	12 or more	7	7	7	7	

14. Apart from official class periods, about how many hours a day (on average through the week in term time) have you spent on German studies for your degree course?	Hours per day:	1 or less	1	
		2	2	
		3	3	
	<u>RING ONE CODE</u>	4	4	
		5	5	
		6	6	
		7 or more	7	

15. (a) Independently of, and in addition to the reading prescribed for courses, do you read in German?	<u>RING ONE CODE</u>	Yes	1	
		No	2	
<u>IF "YES" ANSWER (b) and (c)</u>				
(b) About how many hours per week do you spend on such extra-curricular reading?	Hrs per week:	1 or 2	1	
	<u>RING ONE CODE</u>	3 or 4	2	
		5 or 6	3	
		7 or more	4	
(c) What sort of German material do you tend to read?				
<u>ANY NUMBER OF CODES MAY BE RINGED HERE</u>	20th century literature		Y	
	19th century literature		X	
	Pre-19th century literature		0	
	German literary criticism		1	
	General social sciences/history/ philosophy		2	
	Popular technology		3	
	"Illustrierte" e.g. Stern, Bunte, Quick, etc.		4	
	Newspapers e.g. Welt, FAZ, SUDDEUTSCHE Z etc.		5	
	Political "Zeitschriften" e.g. Spiegel, Volkswirt, Zeit, etc.		6	
	_____ Other (please specify)		7	

./.

Office use

16. Does your university have a language laboratory?

RING ONE CODE — Yes 1, No 2

IF "YES"

(b) Do you use or have you used the language laboratory for private (i.e. voluntary) study purposes?

PLEASE RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR OF YOUR DEGREE COURSE

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year
Never	1	6	1	6
Sometimes	2	7	2	7
Quite often	3	8	3	8
Frequently	4	9	4	9

17. How would you rate your own overall ability in German in comparison with other students of German in your year, i.e. taking into account understanding, speaking, reading, writing, would you say you were among:

RING ONE CODE ONLY

the top 25%	1
the top 50%	2
the lower 50%	3
the lowest 25%	4

18. Please show how you feel about the two statements below by circling one code along each of the graded scales.

(a) "My class of degree in finals will depend to a very considerable extent on my ability to speak and understand spoken German to near-native proficiency."

RING ONE CODE

Definitely my feeling							Not my feeling at all
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	

(b) "My class of degree in finals will depend to a very considerable extent on my ability to read and write German to near-native proficiency."

RING ONE CODE

Definitely my feeling							Not my feeling at all
7	6	5	4	3	2	1	

			Office use
19.	How important to you, personally, are each of the following four "skills" in German?		
	(a) Listening/understanding	Little importance	1
	RING ONE CODE	Some importance	2
		Great importance	3
	(b) Speaking:	Little importance	1
	RING ONE CODE	Some importance	2
		Great importance	3
	(c) Reading:	Little importance	1
	RING ONE CODE	Some importance	2
		Great importance	3
	(d) Writing:	Little importance	1
	RING ONE CODE	Some importance	2
		Great importance	3
20.	Which one of the following categories most closely represents your main interest in German?		
	RING ONE CODE	German literature	1
		The modern German language as a means of communicating	2
		German philology/linguistics/ Sprachwissenschaft	3
		Economic, political and sociological aspects of German	4
		None of these/Really can't choose	5
21.	(a) Have you ever seriously studied a modern foreign language, other than German, solely for non-examination purposes?	Yes	1
	RING ONE CODE	No	2
	IF "YES"		
	(b) Approximately what level of proficiency do you feel you attained?	Honours degree level	4
		General degree level	5
	RING ONE CODE	GCE "A" level	6
		GCE "O" level	7
		Lower than "O" level	8

./.

YOUR FUTURE

				Office use
22.	Do you expect to use your knowledge of German in your future employment/profession? RING ONE CODE	Yes	1	
		No	2	
23.	Which one of these listed types of work are you most likely to take up? RING ONE CODE	Teaching German	Y	
		Teaching other subjects	X	
		Research in linguistics/ philology/phonetics	0	
		Business	1	
		Civil Service/Local Govt/ other public service ...	2	
		The armed forces	3	
		Translating/interpreting	4	
		Other professional work	5	
		Other (please specify) .	6	
		Not sure	7	

IF YOU ARE NOT MOST LIKELY TO TEACH GERMAN SKIP Q.25
IF YOU ARE LIKELY TO TEACH GERMAN (CODE Y AT Q.23) CONTINUE WITH Q.24

24.	What is the highest level at which you would hope to teach?	Secondary school up to GCE "O" level	1	
		Secondary school up to GCE "A" level	2	
		Further education e.g. College of Education or Technical College	3	
		Higher education e.g. University or polytechnic	4	
		Other (please specify)..	5	
		Don't know	6	

EVERYONE

25.	(a) Will you do a post-graduate year in education leading to a Dip. Ed. (or equivalent)? RING ONE CODE	Yes	Y	
		No	X	
		Don't know yet	0	
	(b) Do you intend to proceed to post-graduate studies other than for a Dip. Ed. (or equivalent) RING ONE CODE	Yes	2	
		No	3	
		Don't know yet	4	
	IF "YES" AT (b)			
	(c) Will this be:- RING ONE CODE	In the UK?	6	
		OR At a German speaking University?	7	
		OR Elsewhere?	8	
		Don't know yet?	9	

./.

26. ASSESSMENT OF YOUR GERMAN COURSES AT UNIVERSITY

One subject heading is dealt with on this page and each of the following four pages:

PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTIONS SEPARATELY FOR EACH YEAR OF YOUR DEGREE COURSE. IF THE SUBJECT WAS NOT COVERED IN ONE OR MORE YEARS (OR YOU WERE AWAY DURING THE YEAR), CIRCLE THE "SUBJECT NOT COVERED" CODE FOR THE APPROPRIATE YEAR.

1. Practical German LANGUAGE classes stressing the LISTENING/UNDERSTANDING and SPEAKING SKILLS

			1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year	Office use
→	NB CIRCLE CODE HERE IF SUBJECT NOT COVERED IN ANY YEAR		1	2	3	4	
(a)	How long did the course last? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	1 term	1	1	1	1	
		2 terms	2	2	2	2	
		3 terms	3	3	3	3	
(b)	How many "class hours" per week were devoted to this subject? (A "class hour" can vary from 40 - 80 mins.) RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	1	1	1	1	1	
		2	2	2	2	2	
		3 - 4	3	3	3	3	
		5 - 6	5	5	5	5	
		7 - 8	7	7	7	7	
		9 or more	9	9	9	9	
(c)	How many students were in these classes? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	under 5	1	1	1	1	
		5 - 10	2	2	2	2	
		11 - 20	3	3	3	3	
		21 - 30	4	4	4	4	
		over 30	5	5	5	5	
(d)	On the whole, did the teacher(s) conduct classes in German or English? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	All or mainly German	1	1	1	1	
		All or mainly English	2	2	2	2	
		Both used about equally	3	3	3	3	
(e)	Did the students use mainly German or English? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	All or mainly German	1	1	1	1	
		All or mainly English	2	2	2	2	
		Both used about equally	3	3	3	3	
(f)	Was the language laboratory used for this subject? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	Not at all	1	1	1	1	
		Occasionally/informally	2	2	2	2	
		Importantly/integrally	3	3	3	3	
(g)	Would you say the main teacher was:						
	A "native" German		1	1	1	1	
	OR Not a native German but with a completely "native" accent		2	2	2	2	
	OR Had a somewhat non-native accent		3	3	3	3	
	OR Had a very non-native accent ...		4	4	4	4	
	RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR						

./.

26. PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTIONS SEPARATELY FOR EACH YEAR OF YOUR DEGREE COURSE. IF THE SUBJECT WAS NOT COVERED IN ONE OR MORE YEARS (OR YOU WERE AWAY DURING THE YEAR), CIRCLE THE "SUBJECT NOT COVERED" CODE FOR THE APPROPRIATE YEAR.

2. Practical German LANGUAGE classes stressing the READING AND WRITING SKILLS.

			1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year	Office use
→ NB CIRCLE CODE HERE IF SUBJECT NOT COVERED IN ANY YEAR			1	2	3	4	
(a)	How long did the course last? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	1 term	1	1	1	1	
		2 terms	2	2	2	2	
		3 terms	3	3	3	3	
(b)	How many "class hours" per week were devoted to this subject? (A "class hour" can vary from 40 - 80 mins.) RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	1	1	1	1	1	
		2	2	2	2	2	
		3 - 4	3	3	3	3	
		5 - 6	5	5	5	5	
		7 - 8	7	7	7	7	
		9 or more	9	9	9	9	
(c)	How many students were in these classes? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	under 5	1	1	1	1	
		5 - 10	2	2	2	2	
		11 - 20	3	3	3	3	
		21 - 30	4	4	4	4	
		over 30	5	5	5	5	
(d)	On the whole, did the teacher(s) conduct classes in German or English? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	All or mainly German	1	1	1	1	
		All or mainly English	2	2	2	2	
		Both used about equally	3	3	3	3	
(e)	Did the students use mainly German or English? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	All or mainly German	1	1	1	1	
		All or mainly English	2	2	2	2	
		Both used about equally	3	3	3	3	
(f)	Was the language laboratory used for this subject? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	Not at all	1	1	1	1	
		Occasionally/ informally	2	2	2	2	
		Importantly/ integrally	3	3	3	3	
(g)	Would you say the main teacher was: A "native" German		1	1	1	1	
	OR Not a native German but with a completely "native" accent		2	2	2	2	
	OR Had a somewhat non-native accent		3	3	3	3	
	OR Had a very non-native accent? .. RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR		4	4	4	4	

./.

26. PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTIONS SEPARATELY FOR EACH YEAR OF YOUR DEGREE COURSE. IF THE SUBJECT WAS NOT COVERED IN ONE OR MORE YEARS (OR YOU WERE AWAY DURING THE YEAR), CIRCLE THE "SUBJECT NOT COVERED" CODE FOR THE APPROPRIATE YEAR.

3. BACKGROUND STUDIES including area and regional studies, History, History of ideas, general social science oriented studies on the German speaking area.

		1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year	Office use
→ NB CIRCLE CODE HERE IF SUBJECT NOT COVERED IN ANY YEAR		1	2	3	4	
(a) How long did the course last? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	1 term	1	1	1	1	
	2 terms	2	2	2	2	
	3 terms	3	3	3	3	
(b) How many "class hours" per week were devoted to this subject? (A "class hour" can vary from 40 - 80 mins.) RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	1	1	1	1	1	
	2	2	2	2	2	
	3 - 4	3	3	3	3	
	5 - 6	5	5	5	5	
	7 - 8	7	7	7	7	
	9 or more	9	9	9	9	
(c) How many students were in these classes? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	under 5	1	1	1	1	
	5 - 10	2	2	2	2	
	11 - 20	3	3	3	3	
	21 - 30	4	4	4	4	
	over 30	5	5	5	5	
(d) On the whole, did the teacher(s) conduct classes in German or English? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	All or mainly German	1	1	1	1	
	All or mainly English	2	2	2	2	
	Both used about equally	3	3	3	3	
(e) Did the students use mainly German or English? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	All or mainly German	1	1	1	1	
	All or mainly English	2	2	2	2	
	Both used about equally	3	3	3	3	
(f) Was the language laboratory used for this subject? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	Not at all	1	1	1	1	
	Occasionally/ informally	2	2	2	2	
	Importantly/ integrally	3	3	3	3	
(g) Would you say the main teacher was:						
A "native" German		1	1	1	1	
OR Not a native German but with a completely "native" accent		2	2	2	2	
OR Had a somewhat non-native accent		3	3	3	3	
OR Had a very non-native accent? .. RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR		4	4	4	4	

./.

26. PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTIONS SEPARATELY FOR EACH YEAR OF YOUR DEGREE COURSE. IF THE SUBJECT WAS NOT COVERED IN ONE OR MORE YEARS (OR YOU WERE AWAY DURING THE YEAR), CIRCLE THE "SUBJECT NOT COVERED" CODE FOR THE APPROPRIATE YEAR.

4. LINGUISTIC and PHILOLOGICAL STUDIES, i.e. History of the German language; linguistic structure of contemporary German, etc.

NB CIRCLE CODE HERE IF SUBJECT NOT COVERED IN ANY YEAR		1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year	Office use
		1	2	3	4	
(a) How long did the course last? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	1 term	1	1	1	1	
	2 terms	2	2	2	2	
	3 terms	3	3	3	3	
(b) How many "class hours" per week were devoted to this subject? (A "class hour" can vary from 40 - 80 mins.) RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	1	1	1	1	1	
	2	2	2	2	2	
	3 - 4	3	3	3	3	
	5 - 6	5	5	5	5	
	7 - 8	7	7	7	7	
	9 or more	9	9	9	9	
(c) How many students were in these classes? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	under 5	1	1	1	1	
	5 - 10	2	2	2	2	
	11 - 20	3	3	3	3	
	21 - 30	4	4	4	4	
	over 30	5	5	5	5	
(d) On the whole, did the teacher(s) conduct classes in German or English? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	All or mainly German	1	1	1	1	
	All or mainly English	2	2	2	2	
	Both used about equally	3	3	3	3	
(e) Did the students use mainly German or English? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	All or mainly German	1	1	1	1	
	All or mainly English	2	2	2	2	
	Both used about equally	3	3	3	3	
(f) Was the language laboratory used for this subject? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	Not at all	1	1	1	1	
	Occasionally/ informally	2	2	2	2	
	Importantly/ integrally	3	3	3	3	
(g) Would you say the main teacher was:						
A "native" German		1	1	1	1	
OR Not a native German but with a completely "native" accent		2	2	2	2	
OR Had a somewhat non-native accent		3	3	3	3	
OR Had a very non-native accent? .. RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR		4	4	4	4	

./.

26. PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTIONS SEPARATELY FOR EACH YEAR OF YOUR DEGREE COURSE. IF THE SUBJECT WAS NOT COVERED IN ONE OR MORE YEARS (OR YOU WERE AWAY DURING THE YEAR), CIRCLE THE "SUBJECT NOT COVERED" CODE FOR THE APPROPRIATE YEAR.

5. LITERATURE: Courses dealing with any aspect of German literature.

			1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year	Office use
→	NB CIRCLE CODE HERE IF SUBJECT NOT COVERED IN ANY YEAR		1	2	3	4	
(a)	How long did the course last? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	1 term	1	1	1	1	
		2 terms	2	2	2	2	
		3 terms	3	3	3	3	
(b)	How many "class hours" per week were devoted to this subject? (A "class hour" can vary from 40 - 80 mins.) RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	1	1	1	1	1	
		2	2	2	2	2	
		3 - 4	3	3	3	3	
		5 - 6	5	5	5	5	
		7 - 8	7	7	7	7	
		9 or more	9	9	9	9	
(c)	How many students were in these classes? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	under 5	1	1	1	1	
		5 - 10	2	2	2	2	
		11 - 20	3	3	3	3	
		21 - 30	4	4	4	4	
		over 30	5	5	5	5	
(d)	On the whole, did the teacher(s) conduct classes in German or English? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	All or mainly German	1	1	1	1	
		All or mainly English	2	2	2	2	
		Both used about equally	3	3	3	3	
(e)	Did the students use mainly German or English? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	All or mainly German	1	1	1	1	
		All or mainly English	2	2	2	2	
		Both used about equally	3	3	3	3	
(f)	Was the language laboratory used for this subject? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR	Not at all	1	1	1	1	
		Occasionally/ informally	2	2	2	2	
		Importantly/ integrally	3	3	3	3	
(g)	Would you say the main teacher was: A "native" German		1	1	1	1	
	OR Not a native German but with a completely "native" accent		2	2	2	2	
	OR Had a somewhat non-native accent		3	3	3	3	
	OR Had a very non-native accent? .. RING ONE CODE FOR EACH YEAR		4	4	4	4	

./.

VISITS TO GERMAN SPEAKING COUNTRIES

27. Have you ever been to a German speaking country (i.e. E. or W. Germany, Austria or German speaking Cantons of Switzerland)?

RING ONE CODE

Yes	1
No	2

IF "NO" PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 37 ON PAGE 17
IF "YES" CONTINUE

28. How old were you when you first visited a German speaking country?

RING ONE CODE

10 years old or less	1
11-15 years	2
16-18 years	3
over 18 years	4

29. (a) On how many separate occasions have you been to a German speaking country (exclude "passing through")?

ENTER TOTAL NO. OF VISITS IN BOX ...

(b) And how many of these lasted 6 weeks or longer?

ENTER NO. OF VISITS OF 6 WKS OR LONGER ...

30. Taking all visits together how much time in total have you spent in German speaking countries?

RING ONE CODE

Less than 4 weeks	1
4-6 weeks	2
6-12 weeks	3
3-4 months	4
5-6 months	5
7-9 months	6
10-12 months	7
13-18 months	8
18 months - 2 years	9
over 2 years	0

./.

QUESTIONS 31-36 SHOULD BE ANSWERED SEPARATELY ABOUT EACH VISIT TO A GERMAN SPEAKING COUNTRY LASTING 6 WEEKS OR LONGER, i.e. each of the visits you entered at Q.29(b)

(IF YOU HAVE MADE MORE THAN SIX SUCH VISITS, TAKE THE SIX MOST RECENT)

			VISIT NO. 1	2	3	4	5	6	Office use
31.	In what year did the visit take place?	ENTER YEAR STARTING WITH MOST RECENT	19..	19..	19..	19..	19..	19..	
32.	In what sized town were you (mainly) staying RING ONE CODE FOR EACH VISIT	Grosstadt	1	1	1	1	1	1	
		Kleinstadt	2	2	2	2	2	2	
		Gemeinde (under 30,000 pop.)	3	3	3	3	3	3	
		Travelled about	4	4	4	4	4	4	
33.	How much German did you speak? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH VISIT	All German (100%)	1	1	1	1	1	1	
		Almost all German	2	2	2	2	2	2	
		German about two-thirds of time	3	3	3	3	3	3	
		German and English about equal	4	4	4	4	4	4	
		English about two-thirds of time	5	5	5	5	5	5	
		Almost all English	6	6	6	6	6	6	
34.	(a) Was the visit "prescribed" as compulsory by your university/ college? RING ONE CODE FOR EACH VISIT	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
		No	X	X	X	X	X	X	
	(b) During which term(s) did it take place? Terms: 1-3 (inc. long vac)		1	1	1	1	1	1	
	4-6 (inc. long vac)		2	2	2	2	2	2	
	6-9 (inc. long vac)		3	3	3	3	3	3	
	10-12		4	4	4	4	4	4	
	RING ONE CODE FOR EACH VISIT								

./.

	VISIT NO. 1	2	3	4	5	6	Office use
→ ENTER YEAR OF VISIT AS ON PREVIOUS PAGE	19..	19..	19..	19..	19..	19..	
35. What were you doing during the stay?							
Holiday, leisure activities	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
German university course	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Non-university course in German, German civilisation etc.	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Teaching English in school	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Teaching English in higher education establishment	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Other job involving little use of English	3	3	3	3	3	3	
Other job definitely involving use of English	4	4	4	4	4	4	
Attending school full time	5	5	5	5	5	5	
Other	6	6	6	6	6	6	
RING ONE CODE FOR EACH VISIT							
36. How would you rate your proficiency in the four "skills" immediately prior to the visit?							
(a) Listening to/ understanding German native like	1	1	1	1	1	1	
very good	2	2	2	2	2	2	
good	3	3	3	3	3	3	
fair	4	4	4	4	4	4	
poor	5	5	5	5	5	5	
very poor	6	6	6	6	6	6	
non-existent	7	7	7	7	7	7	
RING ONE CODE FOR EACH VISIT							
(b) Speaking German native like	1	1	1	1	1	1	
very good	2	2	2	2	2	2	
good	3	3	3	3	3	3	
fair	4	4	4	4	4	4	
poor	5	5	5	5	5	5	
very poor	6	6	6	6	6	6	
non-existent	7	7	7	7	7	7	
RING ONE CODE FOR EACH VISIT							
(c) Reading German native like	1	1	1	1	1	1	
very good	2	2	2	2	2	2	
good	3	3	3	3	3	3	
fair	4	4	4	4	4	4	
poor	5	5	5	5	5	5	
very poor	6	6	6	6	6	6	
non-existent	7	7	7	7	7	7	
RING ONE CODE FOR EACH VISIT							
(d) Writing German native like	1	1	1	1	1	1	
very good	2	2	2	2	2	2	
good	3	3	3	3	3	3	
fair	4	4	4	4	4	4	
poor	5	5	5	5	5	5	
very poor	6	6	6	6	6	6	
non-existent	7	7	7	7	7	7	

Office use

37. Below are some of the possible reasons for choosing to study German. Please read them carefully, and for EACH ONE indicate how YOU feel about it by circling one code along the graded scale.

(a) It will help me to a better understanding of German people and their way of life

not my feeling at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | definitely my feeling

RING ONE CODE

(b) I feel that no one is really educated unless he if fluent in at least one foreign language.

not my feeling at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | definitely my feeling

RING ONE CODE

(c) I need it in order to get a good degree

not my feeling at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | definitely my feeling

RING ONE CODE

(d) It will enable me to make good friends more easily among German speaking people

not my feeling at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | definitely my feeling

RING ONE CODE

(e) It will enable me to meet and converse with a more varied cross-section of people

not my feeling at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | definitely my feeling

RING ONE CODE

(f) I think it will be useful in getting a good job

not my feeling at all | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | definitely my feeling

RING ONE CODE

Thank you very much for your co-operation in completing this questionnaire

./.

A B S T R A C T

The paper describes Phase I of the author's UK testing programme for German, which parallels the broader 1967 study by Carroll in the US, and is based on eleven hypotheses centred on time abroad as the most important variable.

The potential sample, drawn from a wide range of HE establishments, was 400 students.

The tests used were:

(1) The MLA Advanced Proficiency Tests (these accounted for what the author calls the "Dependent Criterion Variables").

(2) The Carroll-Sapon Modern Language Aptitude Test, Alice Heim's "AH5 Group Test of High Grade Intelligence", and a comprehensive questionnaire devised by the author (these accounted for the "Independent Predictor Variables", which would be used in an attempt to explain the patterned variations in the "Dependent Criterion Variables").

The author has as yet no conclusive results to offer, in part due to the generally poor response, which he finds lamentable and surprising in view of the valuable, first-ever opportunity afforded by the programme of investigating the effectiveness of current instructional procedures and the small amount of time needed for carrying out the tests. From a previous pilot study, he notes a malaise among students in respect of their language-learning experience, and also that this malaise reaches a peak in their final year.

There will be a follow-up programme, Phase 2, to analyse and explain the differences between the growth of the learning curves and differences in terms of student and institutional factors as revealed from analysis of the questionnaires. This follow-up is, of course, contingent on the continued response and co-operation of all concerned.

The author sees a future in establishing more realistic, more closely defined, achievable goals based, for example, on the Foreign Service Institute Proficiency Ratings, and stresses the importance of developing the receptive rather than the productive skills in the country of the students' native language as preparation for a quicker and more graceful transition to proficiency in the productive skills together with further improvement in the receptive skills during the students' "in-country" language-learning experience.

./.

Appendices include the following:

(1) A description of the Carroll-Sapon ML Aptitude Test.

(2) Response rates.

(3) A Description of the Foreign Service Institute Proficiency Ratings.

(4) Details of the institutional sample.

(5) The student questionnaire.